



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,984	03/18/2004	Marcia R. Meyer	026.0006	8929
29506	7590	05/19/2008	EXAMINER	
INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ, P.C.			FERNSTROM, KURT	
7010 E. COCHISE ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85253			3711	
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/19/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@ifllaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/804,984	Applicant(s) MEYER ET AL.
	Examiner Kurt Fernstrom	Art Unit 3711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 13-26 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-10, 12 and 27-32 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/946B)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 4 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Aafedt. Aafedt discloses in Figures 1 and 2 and in the specification a device comprising two pluralities of design samples, where each of the pluralities of design samples is attached via a binding mechanism such that the samples can be rotated about the binding mechanism around a common axis. The numbers displayed by Aafedt are designs in the broad sense of the term, and the samples in each of the stacks are the same, and movable such that any of the design components can be selectively displayed and viewed together. With respect to claim 4, the numerical designs are broadly considered to be patterns. With respect to claim 12, Aafedt discloses a ring binding.

Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10, 27-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Raiche. Raiche discloses in Figure 1 and in the specification a device

comprising at least four pluralities of design samples 12, 14, 16 and 18, where each of the pluralities of design samples is attached via a binding mechanism 24 such that the samples can be rotated about the binding mechanism around a common axis. The numbers displayed by Raiche are designs in the broad sense of the term, and the samples on each of the wheels are the same, and movable such that any of the design components can be selectively displayed and viewed together. With respect to claims 4, 7, 10 and 28, the numerical designs are broadly considered to be patterns.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 27-29 and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aafedt in view of Summers. Raiche discloses all of the claimed limitations with the exception of the third and fourth pluralities of design components. However, it is known to provide a scorekeeping device with the numbers separated into a single digit on each display such that four pluralities of design components are provided, as disclosed for example by Summers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art to modify the teachings of Aafedt by providing four pluralities of design components for the purpose of allowing a user to change a single digit at a time. With respect to claims 7, 10, and 28, the numerical

designs are broadly considered to be patterns. With respect to claim 32, Summers discloses a stack 20 which can be considered a fourth plurality of design samples where the samples are different from the other pluralities of samples.

Claims 6, 9 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raiche in view of Danino. Raiche discloses all of the claimed limitations with the exception of the different sequencing of the design components. However, it is known to provide a number wheel device with the numbers presented in different sequences, as disclosed for example by Danino. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art to modify the teachings of Raiche by providing design components in different sequences for the purpose of varying how the components are presented.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 11 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 13-26 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: With respect to claim 11, there is no suggestion of an arrangements where three pluralities of design components have the same color samples, and a fourth component has different color samples as recited. With respect to claims 13-26, the

arguments presented by applicant with respect to the prior rejections are persuasive. Sherman does not disclose two pluralities of design components where each plurality has the same design component samples, because Sherman discloses different types of materials upon which the designs are presented. Similarly, Craig and the other prior art disclose devices where each plurality of design components contains the same design component samples. While Raiche, Aafedt, Summers et al disclose the structure of the claims rejected above, the operation of these devices is very different from that of Craig, Sherman et al, and there is no suggestion to use the scoreboard type devices to perform the claimed method, nor is there any suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Raiche, Aafedt, or Summers with those of Craig, Sherman or the related prior art to create the claimed method without using impermissible hindsight.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10, 12 and 27-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Because the new grounds of rejection were not necessitated by amendment, this action is made non-final.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Gustafson, Miller and Morris disclose scoreboards with rotating

displays. Stuart, Sprague and Shapiro disclose rotating displays having pluralities of design components.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kurt Fernstrom whose telephone number is (571) 272-4422. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Kim can be reached on 571 272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kurt Fernstrom/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3711

May 9, 2008